

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

		<u> </u>			
APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/808,584	03/14/2001	John R. Jacobson	55559USA6A	3434	
32692 7	590 03/19/2003				
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			EXAMINER		
PO BOX 3342° ST. PAUL, M			EDWARDS, LA	EDWARDS, LAURA ESTELLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1734	14	
			DATE MAILED: 03/19/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- :=	_	G G
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
· Advisory Action	09/808,584	JACOBSON ET AL.
navious notion	Examiner	Art Unit
<i>*</i>	Laura E. Edwards	1734
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2003 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendme oppeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in
PERIOD FOR	R REPLY [check either a) or b)]
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing db The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 1706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The thing the period of 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the short (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three the period of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	is Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS the date on which the petition under 37 extension and the corresponding amountened statutory period for reply original	g date of the final rejection. OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee unt of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under lly set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 19 February 20 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37		•
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:	
(a) They raise new issues that would require f	further consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N	ote below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the applications issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appeal t	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding numl	ber of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following r	rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted	I in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ reque application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendation of how the new or amended claim		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ows:	
Claim(s) allowed: none.		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-35 and 57.		•
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 36-56		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) approved or b)	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	Vo(s)
10. ☐ Other:		16A
	•	
		Laura E. Edwards Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1734

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 09/808,584

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments in the current response remain the same as discussed in the interview summary as 1/27/03. Applicants and the Examiner remain to disagree. Furthermore, the Examiner remains unconvinced that the claimed invention is patentable in view of cited prior art to conventional metering apparatus.